



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,308	09/18/2003	Luke A. Braud	027385-000110US	6192
20350 7590 04/30/2009 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,308

Applicant(s)

BRAUD ET AL.

Examiner

LAURIE RIES

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-12 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 4, 13 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/30/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Response to Election/Restriction, filed 12 March 2009, and IDS, filed 30 January 2004, to the original application filed 18 September 2003.
2. Claims 1-20 are elected for examination. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. Applicant is required to cancel non-elected Claims 21-29 in the next response to this Office action.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election of Group I (Claims 1-20) in the reply filed on 12 March 2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 30 January 2004 was filed after the mailing date of the original application on 18 September 2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz (U.S. Publication 2003/0033179 A1) in view of Greenwood (U.S. Patent 7,461,077 B1) and Frank (U.S. Publication 2003/0158975 A1).

As per independent claim 1, Katz teaches:

an integrated business system having at least one Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) database, at least one Customer Relationship Management (CRM) database, and a web server, a method for presenting and editing business data derived from said ERP and CRM databases comprising, at a user computer, receiving a web page from said web server and displaying a rendering thereof to a user in a browser window, said web page rendering comprising a plurality of simultaneously displayed portlet windows, each portlet window occupying a relatively small area within said browser window, said portlet windows being selected and arranged according to a user profile for that user

See Katz, Paragraphs 0236-0237, teaching that the VCI user interface 208 preferably consists of a plurality of customizable objects and windows, which may be configured to display graphs, charts, tables, pop-up windows, text boxes, check boxes, status bars, etc. Each customizable object or window may be predefined or modified according to user needs, and may display a customized user interface that integrates a plurality of internal and external data. VCI user interface 208 preferably organizes and displays a plurality of view of internal data 30, a plurality of view of external data 32, and a plurality of view of integrated data resulting from the analysis and integration of internal data 30 and external data 32 in data integration components 118.

Katz also teaches:

*said plurality of portlets comprising: a first portlet displaying a first list of records each comprising a plurality of data elements derived from said ERP module and
a second portlet displaying a second list of records each comprising a plurality of data elements derived from said CRM module*

See Katz, paragraphs 39-40, teaching that the VCI system 28 preferably includes applications and components that integrate internal data 30, external data 32, planning functions 34, and execution functions 36. Planning functions 36 frequently consist of analytical tools for the aggregation and organization of data, such as ERP applications that are used to facilitate the production process; Internal data 30 preferably are comprised of proprietary data aimed at and/or operated by an enterprise from a plurality of internal data sources, including but not limited to ERP systems 52, and Customer Relations Management systems 58.

Katz does not teach expressly:

receiving a single-click from the user to establish a selection of a first one of said data elements from one of said first or second portlets

However, Greenwood teaches this limitation. See Greenwood, Column 35, lines 7-22, teaching that a single-click preferably selects a field for editing.

Katz does not teach expressly:

responsive to said single-click and without requiring intervening user input, placing said first selected data element in an EDIT state and visually highlighting said first selected data element for editing; receiving editing commands from the user modifying an initial value of said first selected data element, said editing commands ending with a first terminating input comprising one of (i) a first click-off comprising a click within said browser window outside said first selected data element, or (ii) a first keyboard data element commit command

However, Greenwood teaches this limitation. See Greenwood, Column 35, lines 7-22, teaching that a single-click preferably selects a field for editing, and Column 33, lines 44-50, teaching that changing data within a cell alerts a record handler to "save" the changed data field. Note that Greenwood teaches that the "save" function is the default action for the record handler, therefore, once the data is changed, should the user terminate the editing with a click-off of the current record, the record handler would be activated and would perform the "save" function.

Katz does not teach expressly:

responsive to said first terminating input, displaying the modified value of said first selected data element and transferring said modified value to the web server, without requiring a page refresh of the browser, for association with said first selected data element in said ERP or CRM database

However, Frank teaches this limitation. See Frank, paragraph 0036, teaching user interface widgets that may be refreshed individually in a Web page without requiring a refresh of the entire page.

Katz, Greenwood, and Frank are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data edit and save features of Greenwood and the refreshing of individual widgets or portlets of Frank with the integrated business system of Katz. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for quick and efficient updating of

individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greenwood and Frank with Katz for the benefit of allowing for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per dependent claim 2, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Greenwood also teaches:

if said terminating input comprises said first click-off, and if said first click-off is at a display position corresponding to a second data element different than said first selected data element, performing the steps of: responsive to said first click-off and without requiring intervening user input, selecting said second data element, placing said second selected data element in the EDIT state, and visually highlighting said second selected data element for editing; receiving

editing commands from the user modifying an initial value of said second selected data element, said editing commands ending with a second terminating input comprising one of (i) a second click-off comprising a click within said browser window and outside said second selected data element, and (ii) a second keyboard data element commit command; and responsive to said second terminating input, displaying the modified value of said second selected data element and transferring said modified

value to the web server, without requiring a page refresh of the browser, for association with said second selected data element in said ERP or CRM database

See Greenwood, Column 33, lines 38-50, teaching that changing data within a cell alerts a record handler to "save" the changed data field. Note that Greenwood teaches that the "save" function is the default action for the record handler, therefore, once the data is changed, should the user terminate the editing with a click-off of the current record, the record handler would be activated and would perform the "save" function. Similarly, additional editing and movement within the data screen would also trigger the default action for the record handler, thus saving additional edited data cells.

Katz, Greenwood, and Frank are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data edit and save features of Greenwood and the refreshing of individual widgets or portlets of Frank with the integrated business system of Katz. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greenwood and Frank with Katz for the benefit of allowing for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect

of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

As per dependent claim 5, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Greenwood also teaches:

if said first or second terminating input comprises said first or second keyboard data element commit command, respectively, performing the steps of: responsive to said first or second keyboard data element commit command, respectively, and without requiring any intervening user input: selecting a third selected data element adjacent to said first or second selected data element, respectively, according to a predetermined inherent direction of said first or second keyboard data element commit command, respectively; and placing said third selected data element in the EDIT state and visually highlighting said third selected data element for editing; receiving editing commands from the user modifying a value of said third selected data element, said editing commands ending with a third terminating input comprising one of (i) a third click-off comprising a click within said browser window and outside said third selected data element,

and (ii) a third keyboard data element commit command; and responsive to said third terminating input, displaying the modified value of said third selected data element and transferring said modified value to the web server, without requiring a page refresh of the browser, for storage in association with said third selected data element

See Greenwood, Column 33, lines 38-50, teaching that changing data within a cell alerts a record handler to “save” the changed data field. Note that Greenwood

teaches that the "save" function is the default action for the record handler, therefore, once the data is changed, should the user terminate the editing with a click-off of the current record, the record handler would be activated and would perform the "save" function. Similarly, additional editing and movement within the data screen would also trigger the default action for the record handler, thus saving additional edited data cells.

Katz, Greenwood, and Frank are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data edit and save features of Greenwood and the refreshing of individual widgets or portlets of Frank with the integrated business system of Katz. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greenwood and Frank with Katz for the benefit of allowing for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

As per dependent claim 6, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Katz, Greenwood and Frank do not teach expressly:

wherein said first, second, and third keyboard data element commit commands are selected from the group consisting of: a TAB command having a predetermined inherent direction of RIGHT; a SHIFT-TAB command having a predetermined inherent direction of LEFT; an UP ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of UP; a DOWN ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of DOWN; and an ENTER command having a predetermined direction of DOWN

However, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that standard computer keyboards include a TAB command with a predetermined inherent direction of RIGHT, a SHIFT-TAB command having a predetermined inherent direction of LEFT; an UP ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of UP; a DOWN ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of DOWN; and an ENTER command having a predetermined direction of DOWN. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a standard computer keyboard to issue commands using a TAB, ARROW, or ENTER key, providing the benefit of allowing a user to quickly move from one data value to another by typing the appropriate key values.

As per dependent claim 7, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Greenwood also teaches:

wherein said user computer comprises a mouse, and wherein said clicks are mouse clicks

See Greenwood, Column 9, lines 1-11.

As per dependent claim 8, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Katz, Greenwood and Frank do not teach expressly:

wherein said user computer comprises a touch-screen display, and wherein said clicks are touch-screen taps

However, Greenwood teaches that any other device with a screen and a means for the user to interact with the data contents of that screen or display may be used (See Greenwood, Column 7, lines 45-50).

As per dependent claim 10, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Frank also teaches:

wherein said browser comprises Microsoft Internet Explorer Version 5.5 or later

See Frank, paragraph 0011, teaching that the browser may comprise Internet Explorer.

Katz, Greenwood, and Frank are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of the Internet Explorer browser, as taught by Frank, with the business integration system of Katz, Greenwood, and Frank, providing the benefit of allowing users to utilize a common Web browser application to view and edit data.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz (U.S. Publication 2003/0033179 A1) in view of Greenwood (U.S. Patent 7,461,077 B1) and Frank (U.S. Publication 2003/0158975 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Griffin (U.S. Patent 7,496,687 B2).

As per dependent claim 9, Katz, Greenwood, and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Katz, Greenwood, and Frank do not teach expressly *further comprising performing client-side validation of said modified value of said first selected data element prior to said transferring said modified value to the web server*

However, Griffin teaches this limitation. See Griffin, Column 7, lines 10-18, teaching validating product items being ordered when a user selects a buy now feature, tries to add a product item to a shopping cart, or tries to update the quantity of an item already in a shopping cart using an SPI CheckInventory() implementation.

Katz, Greenwood, Frank, and Griffin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data validation of Griffin with the integrated business system of Katz, Greenwood, and Frank. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the data update is valid based on the current data values and constraints. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Griffin with Katz, Greenwood and

Frank for the benefit of ensuring that the data update is valid based on the current data values and constraints to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

7. Claims 11-12, 15-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood (U.S. Patent 7,461,077 B1) in view of Frank (U.S. Publication 2003/0158975 A1).

As per independent claim 11, Greenwood teaches:

an integrated business system having a web server and at least one database, a method for presenting and editing business data derived from the database

See Greenwood, Abstract, teaching querying a data source to obtain data elements in a record for editing. See also Column 35, lines 7-22, teaching that a single-click preferably selects a field for editing.

Greenwood also teaches:

at a user computer, receiving a web page from said web server and displaying a rendering thereof to a user in a browser window, said web page rendering including a listing of a plurality of records derived from the database, each record comprising a plurality of cells

See Greenwood, Column 9, lines 40-53, teaching displaying data cells derived from a data source in a Web page that includes a number of records. See also Figures 8-12.

Greenwood also teaches:

receiving a single-click from the user to establish a selection of a first cell in said listing

See Greenwood, Column 35, lines 7-22, teaching that a single-click preferably selects a cell for editing.

Greenwood also teaches:

responsive to said single-click and without requiring intervening user input, placing said first cell in an EDIT state and visually highlighting said first cell for editing and receiving editing commands from the user modifying an initial value of said first cell, said editing commands ending with a first terminating input comprising one of (i) a first click-off comprising a click within said browser window outside said first cell, or (ii) a first cell-committing keyboard input

See Greenwood, Column 35, lines 7-22, teaching that a single-click preferably highlights a cell and selects the cell for editing, and Column 33, lines 44-50, teaching that changing data within a cell alerts a record handler to "save" the changed data field. Note that Greenwood teaches that the "save" function is the default action for the record handler, therefore, once the data is changed, should the user terminate the editing with a click-off of the current record, the record handler would be activated and would perform the "save" function.

Greenwood does not teach expressly:

responsive to said first terminating input, displaying the modified value of said first cell and transferring said modified value to the web server, without requiring a page refresh of the browser, for association with said first cell in the database

However, Frank teaches this limitation. See Frank, paragraph 0036, teaching user interface widgets that may be refreshed individually in a Web page without requiring a refresh of the entire page.

Greenwood and Frank are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data edit and save features of Greenwood with the refreshing of individual widgets or portlets of Frank. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Frank with Greenwood for the benefit of allowing for quick and efficient updating of individual data values within an enterprise business function such that the user may easily evaluate the effect of changes to individual data values in relation to other current data without the delay caused by updating the entire Web page to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per dependent claim 12, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Greenwood also teaches:

if said terminating input comprises said first click-off, and if said first click-off is at a display position corresponding to a second cell in said listing different than said first cell, performing the steps of: responsive to said first click-off and without requiring intervening user input, selecting said second cell, placing said second cell in the EDIT state, and visually highlighting said second cell for editing; receiving editing commands from the user modifying an initial value of said second cell, said editing commands ending with a second terminating input comprising one of (i) a second click-off comprising a click within said browser window and outside said second cell, and (ii) a second cell-committing keyboard input; and responsive to said second terminating input, displaying the modified value of said second cell and transferring said modified value to the web server, without requiring a page refresh of the browser, for association with said second cell in said database

See Greenwood, Column 33, lines 38-50, teaching that changing data within a cell alerts a record handler to "save" the changed data field. Note that Greenwood teaches that the "save" function is the default action for the record handler, therefore, once the data is changed, should the user terminate the editing with a click-off of the current record, the record handler would be activated and would perform the "save" function. Similarly, additional editing and movement within the data screen would also trigger the default action for the record handler, thus saving additional edited data cells.

As per dependent claim 15, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Greenwood also teaches:

if said first or second terminating input comprises said first or second cell-committing keyboard input, respectively, performing the steps of: responsive to said first or second cell-committing keyboard input, respectively, and without requiring any intervening user input: selecting a third selected cell adjacent to said first or second cell, respectively, according to a predetermined inherent direction of said first or second cell-committing keyboard input, respectively; and placing said third cell in the EDIT state and visually highlighting said third cell for editing; receiving editing commands from the user modifying a value of said third cell, said editing commands ending with a third terminating input comprising one of (i) a third click-off comprising a click within said browser window and outside said third cell, and (ii) a third cell-committing keyboard input; and responsive to said third terminating input, displaying the modified value of said third selected data element and transferring said modified value to the web server, without requiring a page refresh of the browser, for storage in association with said third cell

See Greenwood, Column 33, lines 38-50, teaching that changing data within a cell alerts a record handler to "save" the changed data field. Note that Greenwood teaches that the "save" function is the default action for the record handler, therefore, once the data is changed, should the user terminate the editing with a click-off of the current record, the record handler would be activated and would perform the "save"

function. Similarly, additional editing and movement within the data screen would also trigger the default action for the record handler, thus saving additional edited data cells.

. **As per dependent claim 16**, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Greenwood and Frank do not teach expressly:

wherein said first, second, and third keyboard data element commit commands are selected from the group consisting of: a TAB command having a predetermined inherent direction of RIGHT; a SHIFT-TAB command having a predetermined inherent direction of LEFT; an UP ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of UP; a DOWN ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of DOWN; and an ENTER command having a predetermined direction of DOWN

However, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that standard computer keyboards include a TAB command with a predetermined inherent direction of RIGHT, a SHIFT-TAB command having a predetermined inherent direction of LEFT; an UP ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of UP; a DOWN ARROW command having a predetermined inherent direction of DOWN; and an ENTER command having a predetermined direction of DOWN. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a standard computer keyboard to issue commands using a TAB, ARROW, or ENTER key, providing the benefit of allowing a user to quickly move from one data value to another by typing the appropriate key values.

As per dependent claim 17, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Greenwood also teaches:

wherein said user computer comprises a mouse, and wherein said clicks are mouse clicks

See Greenwood, Column 9, lines 1-11.

As per dependent claim 18, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Greenwood and Frank do not teach expressly:

wherein said user computer comprises a touch-screen display, and wherein said clicks are touch-screen taps

However, Greenwood teaches that any other device with a screen and a means for the user to interact with the data contents of that screen or display may be used (See Greenwood, Column 7, lines 45-50).

As per dependent claim 20, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Frank also teaches:

wherein said browser comprises Microsoft Internet Explorer Version 5.5 or later

See Frank, paragraph 0011, teaching that the browser may comprise Internet Explorer.

Greenwood and Frank are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of the Internet Explorer browser, as taught by Frank, with the business integration system of Greenwood, and Frank, providing the benefit of allowing users to utilize a common Web browser application to view and edit data.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood (U.S. Patent 7,461,077 B1) in view of Frank (U.S. Publication 2003/0158975 A1), as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Griffin (U.S. Patent 7,496,687 B2).

As per dependent claim 19, Greenwood and Frank teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Greenwood and Frank do not teach expressly *further comprising performing client-side validation of said modified value of said first cell prior to said transferring said modified value to the web server*

However, Griffin teaches this limitation. See Griffin, Column 7, lines 10-18, teaching validating product items being ordered when a user selects a buy now feature, tries to add a product item to a shopping cart, or tries to update the quantity of an item already in a shopping cart using an SPI CheckInventory() implementation.

Greenwood, Frank, and Griffin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating data to be presented to a user via an electronic display device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data validation of Griffin with the integrated business system of Greenwood and Frank. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the data update is valid based on the current data values and constraints. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Griffin with Greenwood and Frank for the benefit of ensuring that the data update is valid based on the current data values and constraints to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 3-4 and 13-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim *and* any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Haut (U.S. Patent 7,472,342 B2) discloses a system and method for portal page layout.

- Hutsch (U.S. Publication 2001/0034771 A1) discloses a network portal system and method.
- Jolley (U.S. Patent 7,240,280 B2) discloses a system and method for application flow integration in a portal framework.
- Chowdry (U.S. Publication 2003/0167315 A1) discloses fast creation of custom Internet portals using thin clients.
- Emmerichs (U.S. Publication 2003/0061482 A1) discloses a software security control system and method.
- McLauchlin (U.S. Publication 2004/0193651 A1) discloses a system and method for efficient integration of government administrative and program systems.
- Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent 6,640,249 B1) discloses presentation services patterns in a netcentric environment.
- Notarius (U.S. Publication 2002/0123957 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for marketing and communicating in the winespirits industry.
- Novotny discloses the GridLab portal design.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached on (571) 272-4137.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laurie Ries/
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100
28 April 2009